



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—TWO HOMERIC PERSONAGES.

HECTOR AS A THEBAN HERO IN THE LIGHT OF HESIOD AND PINDAR.

When Professor Erich Bethe¹ viewed his mighty structure of Sagenverschiebungen built on the foundations already laid by Dümmler² he regarded it as impregnable and bomb proof, "bombensicher", and modestly called upon men everywhere to test its great strength by firing at it their biggest guns, "Schleudern Sie gegen ihn die schwersten Granaten Ihrer Kritik". His wish was certainly gratified³ and he soon heard about his ears such a whirl of missiles that he has not brought forth his "werdendes Buch" into such a naughty and uncivil world.⁴ Professor Crusius showed that Bethe based his arguments on flagrant ignorance of the most elementary principles of Greek, e. g., Bethe asserted as a thing beyond dispute that Paris and Deiphobus were worshipped along with Helen as gods in Laconia, and the proof is a passage in a very late writer, Aeneas of Gaza, who has this sentence τὸν γοῦν Μενέλεων καὶ νῆ Δία τὴν Ἑλένην μετὰ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ τὸν Δηίφοβον ἐν Θεράπναις τῆς Λακωνικῆς τοῖς θεοῖς συναριθμοῦντες μετ' ἐκείνων αἰδοῦσι. This passage he translates, "Numbering Menelaus and even Helen together with Alexander and Deiphobus among the gods, etc". That is, he construes the preposition with the accusative as it would be construed with the genitive. The meaning of course is this, "Menelaus they worshipped, yes and even Helen after her affair with Alexander and Deiphobus". That is, the emphasis is placed on the fact that they made a goddess out of a woman with Helen's past, and there is no reference to the worship of these two Trojans in Laconia.

¹ Neue Jahrbuecher VII, 657, XIII, 1.

² Kyrene, Studniczka, Anhang II.

³ Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Bayer. Akad. 1905, 749.

⁴ Since this was written his book "Homer—Dichtung und Sage" has appeared.

There is no other argument for the bold assumption that these two men were once natives of Sparta and received divine honors in Lacedaemon after their death.

Bethe speaks with absolute assurance of a Thessalian Paris, "Alexander nämlich der thessalische Paris", and proves this by a passage from Plutarch, Theseus 34. The passage in question simply tells how Paris had been in Thessaly and been defeated near the Sperchius River, and, as Professor Crusius shrewdly observes, this tale was a later attempt to extend the scope of the plunderings of Paris and to increase the measure of the Trojan guilt. It is out of the question to find in this passage any justification for the assumption implied in the phrase, "der thessalische Paris".

The choice argument of Dümmler and Bethe is derived from the fact that Tlepolemus of Rhodes was slain by his neighbor of the mainland, Sarpedon from Lycia. Here they could find no trace of doubt that the death of that warrior and the scene of the struggle had been bodily lifted and transferred to Troy, a city with which they could have had no possible connection. This argument collapses because of the fact so brilliantly shown by Doctor Leaf in his *Troy* that Lycia depended for existence on her ability to sell her wares in the lands whose commerce passed through the Dardanelles, and that the fate of that country must at some time have been decided in or near the plain of Troy. The facts of geography and commerce show that Sarpedon and his countrymen must have been ardent partisans of the Trojan cause, and also that the people of Rhodes must have been just as eager to break the power which kept them from the rich trade of the Pontus. However much the poet may have adorned the events, he made no mistake in placing the struggle between Rhodes and Lycia at the entrance of the Hellespont. Doctor Leaf has also definitely disposed of the theory that the Trojan war was merely the magnified account of the struggles of early Aeolian settlers endeavoring to get a foothold in Asia.

Dümmler's and Bethe's theory that Hector was a Theban hero transferred to Troy was accepted as an assured fact by Cauer in his *Grundfragen*², p. 195, and he adds this sentence 'Und so haben wir hier ein anschauliches Beispiel von dem Inhalte, den der epische Gesang schon im Mutterlande, vor

der Zeit der aeolischen Kolonisation, gehabt haben muss". The fact that Hector appears as fighting at Troy is explained by Bethe on the theory that the original traditions of Hector were connected with a Troy in Attica and that these were later transferred to the Troad.

We are peculiarly able to test Theban traditions by the writings of two early poets, Hesiod and Pindar. Hesiod outranks any other writer in point of antiquity except Homer, while Pindar in point of time has few rivals, and when to the matter of antiquity is added the fact of his great wealth of myth and traditional allusions he must be regarded as the very greatest authority for all ancient traditions, especially traditions in any way connected with Thebes. These two writers are not only ancient, but what is of far more importance in the present investigation, they are peculiarly independent of Homer, and not only give vast stores of tradition not found in Homer, but even unhesitatingly contradict him. In my Johns Hopkins Dissertation, *A Comparative Study of Hesiod and Pindar*, this sentence was used, "When Hesiod and Homer disagree, Pindar follows Hesiod". We can add to this that Pindar did not feel it necessary to hide behind the shield of Hesiod and that he differed from Homer in matters apparently not touched by Hesiod, e. g. P. XI, 31 describes the death of Agamemnon as taking place at Amyclae, while Homer tells how he was slain in his palace at Mycenae. Frag. 262 (Christ), describes the havoc wrought by Rhesus on the ranks of the Greeks, while in Homer this same warrior is slain before he can raise his spear in battle. We are confident that in coming to Hesiod and Pindar we are coming to untainted literary sources, and that respect for Homer will not dry up the springs of Theban tradition in regard to Hector.

Hesiod has no especial interest in Thebes except in so far as he had the misfortune to have been born at Ascra, a neighboring village, and was familiar with all Boeotian traditions, but with Pindar it was different, he loved Thebes, and in her deep misfortune she was still more dear, he resented the implication found in the phrase "Boeotian swine" and he strove to draw the glance of his contemporaries away from the present sad condition of his native city to her proud position in Hellenic mythology. What a large place Thebe, Cadmus,

Semele, Heracles, and Dionysus have in his poems! The wealth of Theban tradition in Pindar can be appreciated by no one who has not given that particular phase the most careful study. We are on safe ground when we do not doubt that Pindar would have used the patriotic self-devotion of Hector in defending the Thebes that was to somehow atone for the treacherous leaders of the Thebes that is. What do Hesiod and Pindar tell us of Hector and of the city he defended?

HESIOD.

Hector's name is not found in any of the extant poems of Hesiod, and there is not a word in any scholiast or in any writer early or late to give the least indication that Hesiod ever used the name Hector. The one warrior who fought on the Trojan side named by him is Aeneas, and he tells how Aeneas was conceived on the slopes of Ida, i. e. Aeneas did not belong to Europe, but to Asiatic Troy. It is evident that Aeneas' place in tradition is independent of Homer, and his name has no transparent Greek derivation.

Hesiod O. 165, places those warriors in the Islands of the Blest, who had gone in ships over the great crest of the sea to recover the fair-haired Helen:

τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐν νήεσσιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης
ἐς Τροίην ἀγαγὼν Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠγκόμοιο.

These two verses are most significant, since they prove what the tradition was in European Greece. Granted that the Greek colonists or exiles took their own songs with them and substituted the new names for the old, putting an Asiatic Troy where once an Attic Troy had been, but how are we to account for the fact that right here, back in the old home, a Boeotian poet is singing of that same Asiatic Troy? Had Hesiod lived a century or two later we could say he was influenced by Homer, but we cannot accept that answer for a poet of marked independence of Homeric tradition, who was also almost, if not quite, a contemporary. Again in O. 651 he speaks of the Greek ships gathering at Aulis while preparing for their long voyage to Troy.

Many incidental details of tradition not found in Homer are given by Hesiod, e. g. Frag. 15, Rzach, tells why Nestor was

given the title the Gerenian, Frag. 89, names Xanthe as the mother of Machaon, and Frag. 97, tells who was the wife of Sthenelus. These minute matters show that Hesiod was familiar with traditions of heroes found in Homer which are not given by that poet himself, but he has not a word to tell us in regard to Hector, and he knows nothing of the transference of any scene from Hellenic soil to the Eastern Aegean.

This evidence, though for the most part negative, is exceeding strong.

PINDAR.

Pindar in this matter is an authority of the greatest weight, indeed he could hardly speak with greater influence, since he is early, is rich in traditions, does not feel bound to follow Homer, and above all he is a Theban, proud of Thebes' traditions, eager to tell them.

Hector is an especial favorite of Pindar who regards him with a peculiar affection and esteem. In O. II, 89 Achilles is praised as one who by his great prowess "cast Hector down, the invincible, steadfast, pillar of Troy". This is, of course, founded on the Iliad and was evidently composed under the influence of these verses:

Z 402. τὸν ῥ' Ἑκτωρ καλέεσκε Σκαμάνδριον, αὐτὰρ οἱ ἄλλοι
'ΑΣτυάνακτ'· οἷος γὰρ ἔρύετο Ἴλιον Ἑκτωρ.

The play on the word Hector is plainly seen in both Homer and Pindar. Pindar's words are:

ὃς Ἑκτορ' ἔσφαλε, Τροίας ἄμαχον ἀστραβῇ κίονα.

These two poets agree in making Hector the support of Troy. Do they speak of a different Troy? Where is Pindar's Troy situated? He does not leave us in doubt, since he refers to Achilles as one driven by the blast of the sea to Troy N. III, 59: θαλασσίαις ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσι πεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ Τροίαν κτλ. There can be no doubt where Pindar placed the warlike exploits of Achilles, and accordingly where he put the death of Hector. The Troy which lies over the sea can be none other than the Asiatic Troy. Does it seem within the bounds of reason that Pindar with all his love for Thebe should have torn from her crown this precious jewel, Hector, and have honored thereby a foreign city, a city now in ruins?

What could have been Pindar's motive in thus robbing his own city of this great heritage? No one could assume that there was an old tradition that Hector was indeed a Theban, and yet that the tradition known by others was unknown to Pindar. We could draw no arguments from the silences of such a writer as e. g. Solon in regard to traditions, but Pindar dealt in traditions, Theban traditions, yet here is more than an argument from silence, since Pindar definitely assigns Hector and Hector's glory to Asiatic Troy.

In a poem written in honor of a victor from a clan of Salamis, N. II, 14, he uses these words: ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἑκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν. This passage, too, is founded on the Iliad and may refer to the duel between Hector and Ajax or the battle at the ships, or any one of several other scenes. Where does Pindar place this meeting of Ajax and Hector? Here also there can be no ambiguity, since Pindar tells how the blasts of Zephyrus wafted Ajax to Troy, N. VII, 25: ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας

ὄν κράτιστον Ἀχιλῆος ἄτερ μάχα
ξανθῷ Μένελα δάμαρτα κομίσαι θαῖς
ἂν ναυσὶ πόρευσαν εὐθυπνόου Ζεφύροιο πομπαὶ
πρὸς Ἴλου πόλιν.

This too is Homeric and can be connected with no city on this side of the sea.

Pindar in N. IX sings of the honors of Chromius and compares his glorious defense of his own city with the honors which a similar devotion had brought to Hector, vv. 39 f.:

λέγεται μὰν Ἑκτορι μὲν κλέος ἀνθῆσαι Σκαμάνδρου
χεύμασιν ἀγχοῦ.

To which the scholiast gives this wise comment: τὸν δὲ Ἑκτορα παρείληφε καὶ οὐκ Αἴαντα ἢ Ἀχιλλέα, τῷ καὶ τὸν Ἑκτορα μεμαχῆσθαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος, ὡς καὶ τὸν Χρόμιον. The location of the Scamander River can hardly be a matter of dispute. How proud Pindar would have been to have compared the devotion of Chromius with a like sacrifice made by a hero of his own native city! How glad to have shown that the glories of Hector belonged to the waters of Dirce? Why did he assign them to the streams of Scamander? Either Pindar was a

traitor to the past glories of Thebes or he never had heard that Hector was not a Trojan, but a Theban hero. It is unthinkable that there should have been local traditions of Hector, and that Pindar, of all men, should have not known them.

In praising Aegina on the occasion of celebrating a victory won by a native of Aegina he dwells on the past glories of the island and bids the muse tell who it was that slew Hector, I. IV, 39. The reply is, as found in Homer, Achilles whose sires sprang from this very Aegina.

Isthmian VI was composed shortly after the serious defeat the Thebans received at the hand of the Athenians at the battle of Oenophyta. Pindar in this ode sings the praises of a Theban victor to whose family this defeat had brought bitter bereavement, and praises the slain as imitating Hector who in the face of hopeless odds chose to die for his native city. This is the Homeric picture of Hector as he was when he parted with Andromache or when he faced Achilles.

When Pindar composed Isthmian VII Thebes had just passed through the terrible disasters which followed the battle of Plataea. The loss of honor was more awful than the loss of life, and the poet can scarcely lay aside his grief to answer the summons of the Muse. What a comfort now in this hour of shame if he can claim Hector as a child of Thebes and direct the angry glances of men to that better day, that fairer name! He does nothing of the sort, but he tells instead of the exploits of Achilles, of his crossing the sea for the honor of the sons of Atreus, and of his slaying the "high-minded Hector." v. 55: *ὑπέρθυμον Ἑκτορα*.

Pindar mentions Hector by name no fewer than six times, yet he never suggests that he was in any way connected with Thebes, but always makes him the hero and defender of Asiatic Troy. Can any one in the face of this significant fact assert that Pindar knew that at one time his own much-admired Hector was the support of his own beloved but ill-starred Thebes, and yet suppressed this knowledge in silence? What is the use of quoting in the face of this fact writers who lived long after the time of Christ or late authors who had no concern or interest in the glory of Thebes?

Not only does Pindar sing of no Hector except the Trojan

Hector, but what is far more significant he has no knowledge of that Hector except as he found it in Homer. It is easy to put one's finger on some passage in the Iliad which justifies and explains every Pindaric reference to Hector. Pindar was no docile follower of Homer, as I have already shown, and beyond that he often adds details not mentioned in the Iliad, e. g. N. III, 46, he tells how Achilles, because of his unusual fleetness of foot, captured deer without nets or dogs. This is a touch not founded on Homer, yet in harmony with the phrase "the swift-footed Achilles". Why does he add no lines or give no new features to the Homeric picture of Hector? Why did he not at times follow some other tradition? The answer is easy. *There was no other tradition of Hector for him to follow.*

Homer first drew the portrait of Hector and gave him a name, a Greek common noun, and made it a proper noun, the name of a hero. Hesychius tells us that Sappho used this epithet in addressing Zeus, and it was later the name given to the anchors of a ship. This defender was made flesh in Hector. How transparent most of the names given to Hector and his family, Astyanax, Deiphobus, Helenus, Polydorus, Polites, Antiphonus, and Agathon! While the names of those heroes who undoubtedly belonged to tradition do not so easily show their origin, such as Peleus, Tydeus, Ajax, Achilles, Odysseus, Icarius, and Bellerophon.

Why are these names so dark while the names of Hector and his family so transparent? The reason is this, the names of Hector and his brothers, except Paris, do not belong to tradition, are not traditional names. Bethe is quite right in saying that we are not in general to look to Homer for the source of the material used by lyric poets, and I may add that is because they drew on tradition for their myths and their matter, and Homer is not tradition. The Athenian dramatists found mines of wealth in each member of the Epic Cycle, but made little use of Homer as a source. There may be tradition in Homer, but it is only an incident, his aim is poetry; also there might have been poetry in the Epic Cycle, but it was only an incident, its aim was tradition. Homer is not a reservoir of tradition, but he too went to the same source as the lyric poets and the dramatists, here he found his hint for

the Wrath of Achilles, and here Sophocles found a hint for his Ajax, his Electra, and his Philoctetes. Homer stood in just the same relation to tradition as Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. Pindar depended on Homer for his picture of Hector, and later ages had no orthodox view of this hero, hence a grave near the Hellespont and one at Thebes. Two graves were a luxury and so on the basis of the story given in Herodotus of the method by which at the bidding of the oracle Sparta secured the bones of Orestes Greek rationalism used a similar oracle for accounting for the grave of Hector at Thebes. The oracle and the grave were both unknown to Thebes in the time of Pindar, and no tradition whose birth was subsequent to Pindar deserves mention in discussing Homeric origins.

CONCLUSION.

The fact that a Theban Hector never appears in the poetry of Hesiod or Pindar is conclusive proof that the theory which makes of him a local Greek hero is pure fiction. Also the fact that Pindar with all his general independence of Homer does not give a single tradition of Hector not based on the Iliad furnishes telling proof, to my mind at least, that Hector as a hero never existed in tradition outside of Homer. Finally the fact that there was a shrine or grave of Hector at Ophrynum near the Hellespont finds easy explanation in the fact of the application of this very word "hector" to Zeus. Nothing could have been easier than connecting this divine "hector", this "supporter" with Homer's Hector who was indeed created to be *Τροίας ἄμαχον ἀστραβῇ κίονα*.

Part II.

PANDARUS IN HOMER.

The part taken by Pandarus in the story of the Iliad was brief, but important; he appeared early in the action leading to the first day's fighting and was slain near the beginning of the Aristeia of Diomedes. It is hard to measure Homer by hours and minutes, yet judging from the events of that day which preceded the entrance of Pandarus, and from those which followed after his death, we can hardly estimate his heroic career as of longer duration than a single hour. His

importance rests solely on the fact that he wounded Menelaus, broke the truce, and thereby prepared the way for further fighting. The Iliad seemed to have come to a definite standstill at the end of the third book, and thus the treachery of Pandarus was the means by which the poet resumed the action of the poem.

Nearly all of those who do not definitely believe in the unity of the Iliad feel that the poet who described the death of Pandarus in book five knew nothing of that warrior's part in breaking the truce, as described in book four. The apparent discrepancy between these two accounts is the basis for Doctor Leaf's argument in his edition of the Iliad, Introduction to E, p. 193: "It is patent that the Diomedea was composed in complete independence of the two preceding books". Many other editors or writers might be quoted to a like purport.

When Pandarus first appears in book four we learn that he is the son of Lycaon, that he is attended by mighty shield-bearing warriors, that he is from the streams of the River Aesepus, from the city Zeleia, that he is "god-like", "blameless" and "valiant", that he is a most skillful archer, able to hit a deer full in the breast as it leaps from a cliff, and that he is the possessor of a wonderful bow, to the description of which the poet devotes seven verses. The accuracy and the detail with which the warrior and his weapon are described mark him as one who is about to play some important part. Although thus strongly stressed the archer does not reply to Athena nor speak a single audible word, and the scene closes with these five verses Δ 122-6:

ἔλκε δ' ὁμοῦ γλυφίδας τε λαβὼν καὶ νεῦρα βόεια·
 νευρὴν μὲν μαζῷ πέλασεν, τόξῳ δὲ σίδηρον.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ κυκλοτερὲς μέγα τόξον ἔτεινεν,
 λίγξε βίος, νευρὴ δὲ μέγ' ἴαχεν, ἄλτο δ' οἰστὸς
 ὀξυβελῆς καθ' ὄμιλον ἐπιπέσθαι μενεαίνων.

With the speeding of the arrow the archer is apparently forgotten, but every reader feels that he cannot be allowed to escape and that he will reappear to pay for his treason. Homer allows no one to wound a Greek of importance and then to slip off unnoticed in the crowd. Hector and Euphorbus slew Patroclus, but it cost them their lives; Coon thrust

Agamemnon, Socus pierced Odysseus, but they died to atone for their brief glory. There was no treachery in the exploits of the four just named, yet they all met the fate appointed for every Trojan who had the audacity or fortune to wound a Greek chieftain. Paris alone escaped the working of this universal law, since tradition, pre-Homeric tradition, had already decided that his death is to follow the death of Achilles. The man who wounded Menelaus, and by that act became guilty of the basest treachery, cannot escape, Pandarus must appear again and pay with his life for his rashness and his treason. When he next appears he will need no introduction, but will come on as one already known to the hearer or reader. Pandarus remains near the scene of action with quiver open, bow uncovered, and strung, ready for immediate service.

After the wounding of Menelaus events follow each other with bewildering rapidity and Diomede soon emerges from the confusion as the great champion of the Greeks, whose exploits are likened to a raging torrent which breaking through the dikes devastates vineyards and harvests:

E 93: ὥς ὑπὸ Τυδείδῃ πυκιναὶ κλονέοντο φάλαγγες
Τρώων, οὐδ' ἄρα μιν μίμνον πολέες περ ἑόντες.

Just at this juncture and without a word of introduction, also with no mention of any preparation, Pandarus appears. The verses which immediately follow the two quoted are these:

E 95: τὸν δ' ὥς οὖν ἐνόησε Λυκάονος ἀγλαὸς υἱὸς
θύνοντ' ἄμ πεδίον πρὸ ἔθεν κλονέοντα φάλαγγας
αἰψ' ἐπὶ Τυδείδῃ ἐτιταίνετο καμπύλα τόξα,
καὶ βάλ' ἐπαίσσοντα, τυχὼν κατὰ δεξιὸν ὤμον.

Here not even the name of the archer is given, but we know it is Pandarus from his introduction in the preceding book. There is no reference to his city or to his country, no account of his uncovering his quiver, and none of his stripping and bending the bow. We infer that he is an illustrious archer from the accuracy with which he shoots, but in this particular place the poet tells us nothing. How does it happen that he is so well-prepared that he can use his bow in an instant?

How does it come about that he needs no sort of introduction? Why is so important an actor not even named? The one answer to these and similar questions is that Pandarus has already been introduced, his bow was already prepared for immediate service, and the fact that he is a mighty archer is already known to the hearer.

Those who reject Pandarus from the previous book must prepare for him some similar introduction and exploit before his appearance in E, since no unknown and unnamed warrior could without any preparation and at his first appearance play the part assigned to him in this book.

The arrow aimed at Diomedes did not slay him, but the wound was so serious that when Athena came to join the ranks of the Greeks, E 794 ff., she found him nursing his wound and wiping the blood therefrom. The shot fired at Menelaus was a covert shot, and the Greeks, at least, did not know who had aimed it. Diomedes too seems to have been struck when he was turned away from Pandarus and not to have known by whom he was shot until Pandarus boastfully tells him. The wounding of Diomedes makes the doom of the truce-breaker doubly sure. The fact that Pandarus does not meet his anticipated death at his first appearance after he has broken the oaths is an excellent example of Homeric retardation which Professor Roemer has repeatedly shown is so marked a feature of the poet's style. See Index to Roemer's *Homerische Aufsätze*, s. v. Retardation. Although the death of Pandarus has been postponed he has not escaped.

Pandarus has now become an important character, he has seriously wounded two of the foremost Greek leaders, while no other Trojan has thus far drawn blood from any Greek of importance. We know now that Pandarus is a great master of the bow, and we approve the choice of Aeneas who, ignorant of these two shots, decides to find him and to use his astounding prowess. When Aeneas urges him to aim an arrow at Diomedes he is urging a man with whom the hearer is already familiar, and there is therefore no special introduction. Pandarus replies to his urgings with a speech of thirty-eight verses. The length of this speech shows that he has already won a position of such prominence as to justify the poet in putting into his mouth so many verses, verses almost

exclusively about his own affairs and himself. It is unthinkable that Homer would have allowed so many verses to a warrior of the small importance of Pandarus, if that importance is confined to the fifth book. We learn many things about him which could not be told at his previous appearance. We are told of his horses at home, and why he left them there, and why he came to Troy relying on his bow. He tells us that his failure with his bow has so discouraged him that he will not venture another shot, and even threatens to break and burn this vain weapon. Those who deny to Pandarus of E any part in the breaking of the truce must assume that this unusual dejection comes from the partial failure in a single shot, a shot that severely wounded even if it did not slay Diomedes. Can we believe that a great archer, who had come from afar, with the sole purpose of using his bow, would have been thus dejected by the one shot aimed at Diomedes and that he would refuse to try again? The utter despondency shown in

E 214: αὐτίκ' ἔπειτ' ἀπ' ἐμείο κάρη τάμοι ἀλλότριος φώς,
εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ τάδε τόξα φαεινῶ ἐν πυρὶ θείην
χερσὶ διακλάσσας· ἀνεμώλια γάρ μοι ὀπηδεῖ,

demands more than the one partially unsuccessful shot described in this book. Critics reject the three verses,

E 206: ἤδη γὰρ δοιοῖσιν ἀριστήεσσιν ἐφῆκα,
Τυδείδῃ τε καὶ Ἀτρεΐδῃ, ἐκ δ' ἀμφοτέρουν
ἀτρεκὲς αἶμ' ἔσσενα βαλὼν, ἥγειρα δὲ μᾶλλον,

as containing the only reference to the breaking of the truce, but the tone of the whole speech demands just such a shot whether Pandarus mentions it or leaves it in silence. The verses add nothing to the whole, but are in such absolute harmony with the words and spirit of Pandarus that they can hardly fail to have sprung from the poet who created the entire scene.

Few indeed of the Trojan warriors have so much space given to them as is given to Pandarus; the account of his death with its staging extends from E 165 to and including 296, that is, it occupies one-hundred and thirty-two verses. Unless Pandarus achieved some greatness by breaking the

truce he is one of the least important actors in the story of the *Iliad*. Coon who wounded Agamemnon, and thereby changed the whole aspect of that day's fighting, appears, performs his part, and is slain, yet despite his importance the poet tells all this in just sixteen verses, *Λ* 248-263. Socus, who wounds Odysseus, to the great disadvantage of the Greeks, appears, acts, and dies, yet but twenty-two verses, *Λ* 428-449, suffice for his entire career. The duel between Sarpedon, the son of Zeus, and Tlepolemus, the son of Heracles, with the speeches involved, the wounding of Sarpedon, and the death of Tlepolemus, is told within the compass of thirty-three verses, *Ε* 628-662. While even the story of the death of the great Sarpedon, including the discussion in regard to his fate carried on by Zeus and Hera in Olympus, occupies but eighty-seven verses, *Π* 419-505. Why did a poet who so condensed the story of these warriors lavish so many verses in describing the death of Pandarus and its setting? It can hardly be because of any inherent worth or prominence, but must be because he has done something which was of unusual importance in the story of the *Iliad*. His appearance with no introduction and no preparation at the time he shot Diomedes demanded some earlier introduction and preparation, not necessarily any previous act of great moment, but it needed at least some previous appearance. The long scene leading up to his death demands both a previous appearance and some act of most extraordinary significance. What act of any consequence does Homer assign to Pandarus other than breaking the truce?

Pandarus bears a Greek name, and his father has the same name as another actor in the events of the *Iliad*, Lycaon, a son of Priam, hence it is probable that he does not belong to pre-Homeric tradition, but was created by the poet for the one purpose of breaking the oaths and thus setting the battles of the *Iliad* in motion. When this work is done he must reappear and be punished. When he has fallen, as poetic justice demands, Homer has no further interest in him, and he does not even stop to tell what has become of the corpse or to dwell on the fate of those who break solemn oaths.

The poet draws no inferences from the death of this treacherous archer, even if the hearer or reader does.

The fact that Homer passes by his fate in silence is the chief reason which has led certain scholars to deny all connection between the account of the broken truce and this story of his death. Ameis-Hentze to E 294: "Der so nahe liegende Gedanke, dass Pandaros durch seinen Tod den Vertragsbruch büßen musste, bleibt auffallenderweise unberührt". Doctor Leaf, Introduction to E: "As they stand they emphasize the complete silence of Diomedes about the gross treachery of his victim, or of the poet who misses the imperative duty of calling attention to the swift retribution which overtakes the violator of the truce". However there is an emphasis of silence quite as effective as that of words. The traitor beyond all others was Judas Iscariot, and those who tell of his treason were so deeply interested in its results that they might be excused for feeling with unwonted keenness and for pressing to its utmost limits "the imperative duty of calling attention to the swift retribution, etc". But did they feel this obligation? John was in the garden with Jesus when Judas betrayed his Lord with a kiss, yet John never hints at the fate of the traitor, he drew no moral lessons. Luke in his gospel, and Mark in his, failed to make any reference to what became of Judas and how he fared as the result of his treason. Even Matthew, whose gospel alone tells of the death of Judas, makes no comment, but simply says, "And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself." The fact that not one of the gospels draws any lesson from the fate of Judas is ample answer to the charge that Homer could not neglect the opportunity presented by the death of Pandarus of drawing a moral in regard to the doom of traitors.

To demand of the poet that he draw all possible or inevitable conclusions, that he must not only show that treason leads to death, but after the traitor's death he must add the lesson as a Q. E. D., is to demand a thing not always present even in history. When Herodotus gave the reasons which influenced the Persians to land at Marathon in their preparations for an attack on Athens, the first and chief reason was that Marathon was a plain peculiarly fitted for the movements of cavalry, *καὶ ἦν γὰρ ὁ Μαραθὼν ἐπιτηδεύτατον χωρίον τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐνιππεύσαι*, Her. VI, 102. However in the account itself of the battle fought at Marathon Herodotus does not make a single refer-

ence to the Persian cavalry, and mentions neither their absence nor their presence. He never explains why he mentioned the cavalry, in the preparations for landing, yet ignored them at the time of the battle itself.

If these two accounts, the one of the landing, the other of the battle, had been in Homer and not in Herodotus, the proof of diverse authorship would be regarded as final.

Also a second illuminating example from the same author. Darius after the failure of Mardonius and the shipwreck near Mount Athos sent messengers to the various states of Greece demanding earth and water as tokens of submission to the power of Persia. The men of Aegina immediately complied with the demands of the king, wherefor the Athenians were so enraged that they sent envoys to Sparta to charge the Aeginetans with treason to the cause of Greece. In this first account of the visit of the Persian heralds, Her. VI 48-50, no reference is made to their treatment either in Athens or Sparta. The inference from the charge laid before the Spartans by the Athenians is that neither of these states met the demands of the king, but it is only an inference as the historian is silent concerning them. Ten or more years later while Xerxes delayed near Pieria his messengers returned bringing earth and water from many of the states of Hellas, but the king was careful to send no messengers to Athens or Sparta. Why? "King Xerxes had sent no heralds either to Athens or Sparta, to ask earth and water, for a reason which I will now relate. When Darius some time before sent messengers for the same purpose, they were thrown at Athens into the barathrum, at Sparta into a well, and told to take therefrom earth and water to their king". Her. VII 133. It is only by an accident that we learn of the treatment of the messengers sent more than ten years previously. The natural place, one would think, for Herodotus to have told this story was where he told of the success or failure of their mission, but for some reason he delayed it until he told of a second sending of Persian heralds. No one believes that the author of this second account is different from the author of the first. These illustrations, taken from the New Testament and from Herodotus, show how slow one should be in drawing hard and fast arguments from the silences of an author.

CONCLUSION.

Pandarus appears in three different but closely related scenes of the *Iliad*. At the end of the first he is left standing with quiver open and bow uncovered, strung and ready for instant use; he reappears in the second scene with no manner of introduction as one already known to the hearer and with no preparation and without delaying a moment wounds Diomedes. The second scene is impossible without the first. The first and second scenes must have some conclusion, and accordingly demand a third, the traitor must pay for his treason, *δράσαντι παθεῖν*. The third scene has no setting unless the archer has already more than once failed with his bow, and further the detailed description of Pandarus with the long account of his death presupposes that he has been responsible for some deed of unusual importance. This important deed can be none other than the breaking of the truce by the wounding of Menelaus. No one of these scenes in which Pandarus appears can stand alone. The first might stand without the second, but not without the third, the second demands both the first and the third, while the third has no rational content without the first and the second.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, *February* 19, 1914.